IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
CIVIL APPLICATION NO.168 OF 2006
IN
FAMILY COURT APPEAL NO. 91 OF 2006
IN
PETITION NO.A-230 OF 2003

Geeta Shailesh Shenvi ..Applicant
Vs.
Shailesh Pandurang Shenvi ..Respondent

Mr.G.K.Kerkera Advocate for applicant
Mr.V.R.Bhandare Advocate for respondent

CORAM: SMT.RANJANA DESAI & SMT.V.K.TAHILRAMANI,JJ.
DATE : SEPTEMBER 7, 2006

P.C.

1. We have heard the learned counsel for the parties. The learned counsel for the applicant stated that the trial Court has granted meagre amount of Rs.1,000/- as maintenance to the daughter. The daughter is about 6 years of age. She is in Ist standard. He further contended that the amount of Rs.1000/- needs to be enhanced considering the steep price rise.

2. Mr.Bhandare, the learned counsel for the respondent opposed this submission. He submitted that the applicant has not given any particulars as to how much money the applicant is required to spend

on her daughter. He submitted that respondent has to maintain his ailing mother and recently he had incurred expense of about Rs.1,20,000/- for his ailing mother and approximately an amount of Rs.2,00,000/- is still to be spent for her treatment. He submitted that in the circumstances, this Court should not enhance the maintenance amount.

3. In the facts and circumstances of this case, in our opinion, the maintenance amount of Rs.1,000/- needs to be enhanced by an amount of Rs.800/-.

4. We therefore, direct the respondent to pay maintenance at the rate of Rs.1800/- per month instead of Rs.1000/- as granted by the trial Court, to his minor daughter Saniya during the pendency of the instant Family Court appeal. The impugned judgment and order and decree shall remain stayed during the pendency of this appeal subject to the above.

5. Civil application is disposed of in the aforestated terms.

[SMT.V.K.TAHILRAMANI,J.] [SMT.RANJANA DESAI, J.]